

Jeff,

The way great things are built is to incorporate enhancements which usually are the result of criticism which may not be liked by those responsible for the original creation. You completely misunderstand my intent here. I have said in the past and am still telling people today, that the IA site is the best one out there, especially concerning the amount and type of content they have available. If I would have felt the way you have written, I never would have spent, by my own count (which does not include any work I did for the Archive before 2010) nearly 6,000 hours (yes I do keep track of it and no I do not take any tax deductions for any of my contributions) of my own time creating content and putting it up. The time spent alone on copyright investigation is not included also and that was not insignificant.

The INFOPORTAL will not be another IA, I do not think anyone could easily replace the IA; and that would not be our intent in any case. The problems I see should, and upon which others are commenting here, really have been addressed some time ago. Offers have been made, but no one seems to be interested in contacting any of the main providers of content unless they apparently are large education or corporate organizations. The shame here is that Brewster or anyone in the administration at the Archive does not think (heh wait a minute, we have people willing to help us without charge, may be we should at least talk with them and see if their ideas have any merit) and then if you do not like what we have said, at least give good reasons for not listening. Instead we get the approach more like, 'up yours', if you do not like it leave.

No one at the Archive will yet answer the question concerning what is wrong with having two sets of web sites; I am sure that the group of us who like the old site would keep it running as long as we can without any cost to the Archive. We would even be willing to host it on our own servers if that would be a problem. So you see what the frustration is ... the appearance is that these decisions appear as if they were being made arbitrarily (I am not saying they are, only their [those in power at the Archive at the moment] non-communication makes it appear that they are). Apparently egos are so that people have invested themselves personally into the decisions which they have made and have an irrational reaction when some criticism is leveled. I assure you that this criticism is made out of a love for what has been created at the Archive and I am sorry if some people's egos get hurt along the way. The people whom I work with only know one way to work, that is professionally, truthfully, and honestly. We only know two ways to do things ... good and even better. Optimization should be a hallmark of any system and I am sure people could find issues with what I do also. But the difference is that I am willing to listen to that criticism and incorporate good recommendations into my creations. 'Killing the messenger' has been going I am sure since humans first walked the planet. No one is saying here that you have to do it 'my way' only that people should listen and then if you do not want to accept the recommendation, at least be honorable enough to give a valid explanation explaining why you are not willing to listen. This argument has been going on for some time now ... and I will not name them at this time, but there are people who have skills which would be extremely useful for the Archive as an organization

and are willing to work voluntarily. It is their and all of our losses that the 'people at the top' have become so insular that they cannot even reply to a simple question "why not let a group of us take over the old (classic) site and continue its operation, at no cost to the Archive.

WE ARE STILL WAITING FOR AN ANSWER.

Gerry

GArthus 21 January 2016